REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 16 and 18 have been amended. Claims 6 and 21 have been canceled by this amendment. Hence, claims 1 – 5, 7 and 16 – 20, 22 are pending in the application.

FIG. 3 has been objected because based on the description of the instant specification, FIG. 3 should allegedly be labeled as prior art. The Office Action alleges that the specification discloses an existing b-tree protocol used in many distributed lock management systems or database systems. Applicant has amended FIG. 3 to include the prior art label requested and to include a label labeling the figure as FIG. 3.

Claim 6 has been objected to. The objection has been obviated because claim 6 has been canceled.

Claims 1 – 6, and 16 – 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 5,454,108, herein after Devarakonda.

Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Devarakonda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,285,528, hereinafter Hart.

Claims 1 and 16

Claims 1 and 16, recite:

receiving a message from said lock management system that indicates that said
      first request to lock a resource is denied;

...

wherein said first data [in the message] identifies another resource, wherein said
      lock management system will not grant another lock for said another
      resource while said blocking condition is in effect; and

based on said first data, said first requester obtaining notification of when said
      blocking condition should no longer cause denial of a request, wherein

OID 2001-105-01

obtaining notification includes transmitting a request for a lock on said another resource.

Thus, Claims 1 and 16, require as a response to a denial of a request for a lock on a resource, that:

(1) a message that identifies another resource for which a lock is to be requested, and

(2) requesting a lock on the resource to obtain notification of when the blocking should no longer cause denial of a request for a lock on the resource.

The combination of the above highlighted features is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

A basis for the rejection of claims 1 and 16 is a correlation drawn by the Office Action between a lock for resources in claims 1 and 16 and the tokens for resources in Devarakonda. Accordingly, the Office Action must also correlate a request for a lock on a resource to a request for a token for the resource. Assuming these correlations are true, Devarakonda fails to disclose or suggest in way the above highlighted way of responding to a denial for a request for a lock.

The following passage is an example Devarakonda's teachings about responding to a denial for a token

"However, if there are conflicting tokens, then the lock control server 112 responds with a NOT OK message and a list (a "copyset") of the local lock managers with conflicting tokens....If, in response to an ACQUIRE or UPGRADE request, a NOT OK message is received from the LCS, the response analysis block 914 signals the LLM downgrade/revoke request generator block 916. The LLM downgrade/revoke request generator block 916 sends a revoke/downgrade message to all LLMs in the copyset supplied by the LCS." (col. 4, lines 30 – 47, see also Abstract, Summary of Invention).

In Devarakonda, in response to denial of a request for a token on a "requested" resource, a lock manager receives a list of local lock managers, and for each, sends a

OID 2001-105-01

downgrade/revoke message for a token covering the requested resource already held by local lock manager. A revoke request is a request to surrender a token that covers a file. A downgrade request is a request to downgrade a token that covers a file. (See col. 9, lines 50 – 66)

These teachings of Devarakonda do not disclose or suggest in any way the features of claims 1 and 16 highlighted above. A response to a denial of a request for a lock on a resource, where the response entails a list of entities that already hold a token that covers the resource, fails to disclose or suggest in any way a response that entails a message that identifies another resource for which a lock is to be obtained. A response to a denial of a request for a lock on a resource, where the response entails requesting entities that already hold a token for the resource to downgrade or revoke the token, fails to disclose or suggest in anyway requesting a lock for another resource.

Based on the foregoing, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest in anyway certain features of claims 1 and 16. Therefore, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest in anyway all the features of claims 1 and 16. Claims 1 and 16 are therefore patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Remaining Pending Claims

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental

OID 2001-105-01

difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: June 29, 2005

Marcel K. Bingham
Reg. No. 42,327

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext.206
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on ___June 29, 2005___ by _____

OID 2001-105-01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Sashikanth Chandrasekaran   Confirmation No.: 2140

Application No.: 10/056,716   Group Art Unit: 2161

Filed: January 22, 2002   Examiner: Chen, Te Y.

Title: SEMANTIC RESPONSE TO LOCK REQUESTS TO REDUCE COHERENCE OVERHEAD IN MULTI-NODE SYSTEMS

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DRAWING TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Sir:

Enclosed herewith please find:

( ) _____ sheets of redlined drawing(s) which indicate proposed changes to the drawing(s). Upon approval of these proposed changes, formal drawing(s) will be submitted.

(X) _1_ sheet of corrected formal drawing(s), as required by the Office Action dated March 29, 2005.

( ) _____ sheets of corrected formal drawing(s), as required by the Notice of Patent Drawing(s) Objection (PTO-948) and approved in the Notice of Allowability dated _____.

( ) _____ sheets of formal drawing(s). Please substitute these formal drawing(s) for the informal drawing(s) originally filed.

Examiner's approval of the entry of these drawings is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: June 29, 2005

Typed Name: Jennifer Newell

Signature:

Respectfully Submitted,

By
Marcel K. Bingham
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,327
Date: June 29, 2005
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 206

OID 2001-105-01